

BP  
a connector arrangement comprising a body portion and a first projection portion extending from said body portion of said connector arrangement, wherein said opening is adapted to receive said first projection portion, and said body portion of said connector arrangement is disposed on said ring case such that said projection portion is positioned within said opening, such that an end of said projection portion engages said at least one portion of said ring member; and

a first end and a second end of said electrical wire, and a first lead wire and a second lead wire of an electric circuit connected to said first and said second ends, respectively in said connector arrangement.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Applicant has amended original claim 1 to better describe the claimed invention. Applicants are including a marked-up copy of amendments to the claims, with this responsive amendment. No new matter is added to the foregoing amendments, and these amendments are fully supported by the specification. See, e.g., Appl'n, Fig. 8. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the above-captioned patent application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

#### REMARKS

1. Rejections

Claims 1, 2 , and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2, as allegedly indefinite. Claims 1 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly anticipated by Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA"). Moreover, claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly rendered obvious by AAPA in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,307,038 to Ishimaru. Applicant respectfully traverses.

2. 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2

Claims 1, 2 , and 4 stand rejected as allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the claimed invention. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that the relationship between the projection portion and the ring member is unclear. Applicant respectfully traverses.